

REMARKS

Claims 29-48 are pending in this application. Claims 29, 37, and 46 are amended. No new matter is added by this amendment.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and § 103(a)

Claims 46 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Mateos US Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0050995, ("Mateos"). Claims 29-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mateo in view of Pettersen U.S. Pat. No. US 6,826,594, ("Pettersen"). Applicants traverse the rejections.

Claims 37-45 are Patentable Over the Cited Prior Art

Claim 37 recites including scripting functions in the web page:

requesting at least a frame of a web page from a managed server, wherein the frame comprises a **first embedded object and a call to a scripting language**

function defined by the first embedded object; ***

receiving the data corresponding to the first embedded object;

calling the scripting language function defined by the first embedded object

The bolded elements are absent from the cited prior art.

Mateos teaches that a CGI program runs queries on a database and then uses a view template to build a web page. The web page is then sent to the client computer. Mateos, c. 4, ll. 22-48. In contrast, the method recited in claims 37-45 offers a simpler approach not possible in the cited art:

The web developer does not need to understand the data generation process, nor does the dynamic data developer need to understand the Web page development process.

Application, p. 16, 13-15. So, by including the embedded object and scripting language functions defined by the embedded object as part of the web page, a web developer can develop a web page using the scripting language functions without having to understand the underlying data generation process, and data generation may be done without understanding Web page development.

On the other hand, in Mateos a CGI program is interpreting a view template to generate a web page for viewing data requested by a web user. In Mateos a web developer could not develop a web page that is delivered to the user separate from the generation of the underlying data. In Mateos the web page illustrated at the bottom of col. 4 to the top of col. 5 is generated by a CGI program using a view template. In contrast, the web page illustrated on page 8 of the Application may be developed and edited by a web page developer.

Pettersen fails to remedy the deficiencies of Mateos. Pettersen refers to defining an area of the web page that is to be remotely managed. Pettersen, c. 4., ll. 8-17. Pettersen does not disclose scripting language functions and data that are defined by embedded object(s).

Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 37 is requested. Since claims 38-45 depend from claim 37, withdrawal of the rejections of claims 38-45 is requested for at least the same reasons as for claim 37.

Claims 29-36 are Patentable Over the Cited Prior Art

Claim 29 recites including scripting functions in the web page:

serving a web page to a requesting computer from a managed server, the web page comprising a source call to an object file and **code including scripting functions defined by the object file**, wherein the requesting computer is remote from the managed server

As discussed above for claim 37, the bolded elements are not found in or obvious from the cited prior art.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 37 is requested. Since claims 38-36 depend from claim 37, withdrawal of the rejections of claims 38-36 is requested for at least the same reasons as for claim 37.

Claims 46-47 are Patentable Over the Cited Prior Art

Claim 46 recites including scripting functions in the web page:

a file system storing a web page that has both a first embedded object configured to access the dynamic data and a second embedded object configured to merge the dynamic data with the web page, wherein the first embedded object is executable on a client remote from the server to request dynamic data, and **wherein the web page includes a scripting language function defined by the second embedded object**.

As discussed above for claim 37, the bolded elements are not found in or obvious from the cited prior art.

Applicant: Robert S. Brayton, et al.
Serial No. 10/037,683, Response to Final OA of 10/28/2008


Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 46 is requested. Since claim 47 depends from claim 46, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 47 is requested for at least the same reasons as for claim 46.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing remarks, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of all rejections and early allowance of all of Claims 29-48 are requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert S. Brayton, et al.



GREGORY J. LAVORONA
REGISTRATION NO. 30,469
DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP
Attorney for Applicants